

LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

Morecambe—
Margate—
Moscow

BY THE
EDITOR

The New Chinese People

BENJAMIN FARRINGTON

October, 1952

One shilling and sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONFIDENCE IN SOCIALISM

'To instil new life into our socialist ideals' — what a grand aim for any meeting or conference of the British Labour movement, great or small. Reading these words, I thought how warmly *Labour Monthly* readers would respond — especially those of our readers attending this year's Labour Party Conference as delegates. For that is exactly the lead that scores of thousands in Britain are looking for, and will increasingly insist upon.

The quotation is from a Lancashire reader: 'My confidence in socialism grows as I read each issue of *L.M.* It instils new life into one's socialist ideals. Thank you for a great Magazine of International Labour.' A similar note is struck by another North-country man, a leading figure in his local Labour Party. He has followed *L.M.* from the first issue in July 1921, still referring to his files of thirty-one years' month-by-month record of the labour movement: 'I look forward to each monthly issue for its clear Socialist thought and analysis, and so feel fortified to debate on the floor of our local Labour Party on each national and international issue as it arises.' (He gets two copies, passing one around among his friends). A young enthusiast down South, with an astounding record for winning new readers, explained how he goes about it. 'I approach the more active Labour workers; for *L.M.* is a magazine requiring more study than the usual political periodical, so I take it to those who are willing and able to benefit from serious political articles. For instance, there is a small council estate here of 16 houses; they are keen workers, so *L.M.* goes into four of those houses.'

'THE YANKSTERS'

Yes, confidence in socialism and instilling new life into the fight for socialist ideas is more than ever important today, 'when the struggle is naturally getting more intensive as world capitalism contracts,' to quote a Yorkshireman. What this means now is stressed in every letter from our American and Canadian friends. A particularly vivid picture comes from a Canadian, who followed on the radio the Republican and Democrat Conventions 'from over the Bacteria Curtain in Chicago, fittingly famed for its gangsters. The U.S. politicians met to scheme the Raw Deal, not only for the people of U.S.A., but for the rest of the world. Hail, the "U.S. way of life." This was how the keynote speech to the Republican circus sounded, given by the old napalm cannibal, Mikado MacArthur. Out of the rabble, a "crusade" was decided upon, which is essentially "peace through atom and bacteria bomb and Eisenhower's grin." Then the Democrats, whose dread of peace and whose love of racketeers at home and Fascist rogues abroad is a menace to humanity — they wallowed in the Big Lie, any trick to cover up U.S. atrocities in Korea. All who disagree with the Gospel of Goebbels now taken over by the U.S. warlords, all who believe in life not death, are regarded as traitors to the "simple faith of our fathers." The hallmark of righteousness is to be in favour of atom and bacteria bombs. In Canada we get the rotten seepage from all this, due to a Dominion Government that goes hand in glove with

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: Morecambe - Margate - Moscow, by R.P.D.	433
THE NEW CHINESE PEOPLE, by Benjamin Farrington	448
MARGATE T.U.C., by John Horner	450
WEST GERMAN FOCUS OF WAR, by Quaestor	460
U.S. 'COPS AND ROBBERS,' by Neil Stewart	465
NIKOLA YAPTSAROV	471
TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO	475
PAPER CUTS FROM NEW CHINA	456-7
Book Reviews: How Music Expresses Ideas, by S. Finkelstein: Rutland Boughton: China's Feet Unbound, by W. G. Burchett: G. Hardy; Ordeal by Slander, by O. Lattimore; T. Mc.W.; British Trade Unionism, by G. A. Hutt: J. Davidson; The Struggle for a Free Press, by E. P. Thompson: B.M.B.; Public Order, by A. G. Keech: A.T.	476

Notes of the Month

Morecambe - Margate - Moscow

Why should we reduce our standards in order to make war on people who are raising their standards?

A delegate at the Margate Trades Union Congress.

THREE Congresses highlight the present world situation and the situation in Britain. At the centre of the world situation, representing the forefront of world development and advance in the present age, the Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on October 5 will fulfil a historic task comparable in its significance to that of its predecessor in 1939. It will reveal the breath-taking achievements and further plans of triumphant socialism advancing to communism, with a flowing horn of plenty like a dream of William Morris. It will throw light on the dark corners of the war plans of the surviving maddened bandits of the deceased old capitalist world, and illuminate the path of humanity for freedom, progress and peace. The hopes of hundreds and hundreds of millions in all continents are turned to this Congress. Its significance is abundantly recognised—whether in fear or hope—by every political section in every country in the world.

Crisis and Challenge

At the same time here in Britain the Congresses of the millions of organised workers of the oldest labour movement in the world, at the very heart of all the sicknesses and contradictions of the dying capitalist order, the Congresses of the Trade Unions at Margate last month and of the Labour Party at Morecambe this month, bear witness—in every speech and contribution and resolution, whatever the political viewpoint—to the deep crisis of capitalism, the worsening of conditions, the grim consequences of the war drive, the domination of Tory reaction. Equally and in consequence they bear witness to the crisis of policies and leadership, the discrediting of old policies, the desperate search for new policies; in short, the crisis of social democracy as the counterpart of the deepening crisis of capitalism. Above all, they bear witness, alike in their debates and in their agenda with the tumultuous spate of militant resolutions, to the rising challenge of millions of workers, who are determined to change the old conditions, to fight the ruling class and the employers for their living needs, to halt the war drive, and to march forward for the aims of peace and socialism, that is, along the road to the same achievements which their Soviet brothers have won. Not yet here is the joy of peaceful socialist construction. Here is the heart of the political battle in the old world. But the battle is rising.

It Moves

New currents are stirring in unhappy crisis-ridden Britain and in the ancient cumbrous machinery of the British labour movement. Not even the most hardened cynical sceptical observer can deny this. Witness the Margate decisions, carried against the resistance of the platform, for extended social ownership as an immediate objective of the next Labour programme, and for the ban on bacteriological warfare; the unanimity for East-West trade; the close on two millions against the rearmament programme; the over two and a half millions directly condemning wage restraint. Witness the Morecambe Labour Party Conference agenda, with its torrent of over four hundred resolutions (almost all from constituency Labour parties), the overwhelming majority pressing for a shift of policy in a leftward direction, criticising the rearmament programme, demanding a change in foreign policy, calling for a new socialist programme, for extended nationalisation, for rights for colonial peoples, and the like. Nor are these only paper resolutions. The mass movement of eight

million workers for wage increases presses forward in face of the Government's and employers' direct rejection. This economic struggle begins to approach, however hesitantly at first, questions of action on a scale long forgotten in Britain. In the present circumstances, also, this economic struggle takes on in certain respects the character of a political struggle, in view of the attitude of the Government. All the tactics of the Government, the employers and the reformist leaders are brought into play to divert the movement. They know that they are walking on the edge of a volcano which is by no means extinct, as they would like to pretend.

When the Giant Awakens

The giant is still only beginning to stir from the effects of the opiate of six years of lies about the 'peaceful social revolution' which left monopoly capitalism entrenched and ended in economic disaster and Tory electoral victory. The terrible anger of the giant is only beginning against the whole gang of parasites and crooks and swindlers who have battered on his labours, lectured him with lies, and danced their mayfly dance on the profits from his exertions. The charlatans are busier than ever to deceive and to confuse, and to paint strange tricked out faces on old lies. But the new life is stirring; the new currents can be felt. To speed and help forward the new currents is the most glorious opportunity of the present moment. All the peoples of the world are looking with anxious hope to the new currents in Britain. Britain is no small country. Britain may be speeding downhill under the old order; but Britain has still a great part to play in the world. Once the masses of the British people throw off the shackles of American domination, of suicidal war policies and of a parasitic monopolist economy which is strangling their lives, and march forward, in unity with the liberation of the colonial peoples, along the road of peace and socialism, then the entire world situation will be transformed. This is the deep significance of the present contests and controversies which revealed themselves in an initial form, however limited the conditions and distorting the mirror, at Margate, and which will further reveal themselves—even though through a veil of still heavier limitations and distortion, on account of the artificial exclusion of the leadership of the left—at Morecambe.

He That Hath Eyes to See

Never, never was the contrast between socialism and capitalism so glaring and inescapable. At the very moment when the wiz-

ened pigmies of the New Fabians are proudly proclaiming their new 'discovery' that socialism is an obsolete illusion, to be abandoned in favour of rosewater moralising over the stinking body of capitalism, at this very moment socialism—not in theory, but in life—is accomplishing economic miracles the like of which the world has never seen. All the most vaunted engineering feats of capitalism—Panama Canals, Suez Canals, Tennessee Valley Projects—shrink to Lilliputian dimensions before the gigantic construction projects which the Soviet Union is now in the course of accomplishing to transform the face of nature on the path of transition from socialism to communism. At the very moment when the crowned heads of flunkey science are mumbling to the famous 'British Ass' and similar gatherings their clerical denunciations of the evil fruits of the tree of knowledge, and announcing their moth-eaten Neo-Malthusian 'discoveries' that food production cannot possibly keep pace with the increase of human beings and that therefore the best solution will be mass human annihilation or the gradual extinction of the human race, the Soviet Union is engaged in making the desert bloom and creating a new irrigated area in the Central Asian region alone equivalent to the combined area of Britain, Belgium, Holland, Denmark and Switzerland, making possible the production of food for an additional hundred million human beings, with a new wheat crop equivalent to the output of the entire wheat belt of Canada or a cotton crop exceeding the combined crop of Egypt and Pakistan.

Figures That Sing

When the new Five Year Plan announces that industrial production by 1955 will be three times the pre-war level of 1940—already an achievement on a scale without parallel in economic history—it is too often forgotten that this comparison with pre-war understates the real increase, because it leaves out of account the initial heavy task of making good a war destruction equally without parallel in the historical record. The United States suffered no war destruction, but was able gigantically to increase its productive resources and capital accumulation through a highly profitable war. The Anglo-American military and political leaders confidently calculated that this same war would reduce the Soviet Union either to complete extinction, as they first hoped, or at any rate to poverty-stricken exhaustion. The war did indeed destroy the equivalent of one third of the Soviet Union's productive resources, as well as taking a terrible toll in blood and

human lives to smash fascism while the Anglo-American leaders brilliantly 'conserved their man-power', as they have since boasted. Thus the real increase from the end of the war is very much greater than a threefold increase. If the pre-war level was reached by about 1948, then the trebling of pre-war industrial production by 1955 would represent the trebling *in seven years* of a level of industrial production already the highest in Europe and the second highest in the world. When the United Nations Monthly Bulletin of Statistics for June, 1952, had to recognise that, on the basis of 1938 as 100, the national income of the Soviet Union in 1951, measured in constant prices, had reached 224, and of the United States 198, then it is obvious that the real comparison of 1946 and 1951 would show much more powerfully the difference in the rate of advance of socialism and even the strongest remaining capitalism.

And Still They Come

Let us also never forget that a corresponding advance, in relation to their very different stages, is registered by all the People's Democracies in Europe (like the recent Bulgarian announcement of the quadrupling of pre-war industrial production, alongside the second all-round reduction of prices this year), and in the Chinese People's Republic, whose third anniversary this month will be able to place on record the marvellous achievement of three years. The same United Nations table already quoted sets out the following contrast between the rate of advance of America and the countries of Marshall Europe, on the one hand, and of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe, on the other.

NATIONAL INCOME 1938 - 1951

(Index numbers of National Income at constant prices. 1938 - 100)

U.S.S.R.	224	U.S.A.	198
Poland	169	United Kingdom	113 (1950)
Czechoslovakia	138	France	106 (1949)

(*United Nations Monthly Bulletin of Statistics*, June, 1952)

This contrast is still greater now, since the productive level of all the Marshall Plan countries has begun to fall absolutely in 1952, according to the latest O.E.E.C. (Marshall Plan Administration) Report.

Who Said What in 1947?

Within a few years of the Marshall 'Recovery' Plan the hard practical test of results has proved that, despite all the Western blockade and bans on trade, the advantage has lain with those

peoples who chose independence, cleared out their monopolists and landlords, and took the economic resources of their countries into their own hands, and not with those who accepted the grand 'solution' offered by the Labour Party and French Social Democrat leaders to stand in the Marshall-queue for dollars. And now the German Democratic Republic, by the memorable decision of this summer, has joined the happy throng and entered on the construction of socialism, at the same time as Western Germany sinks in corruption, unemployment, neo-militarism, dollar subsidies and the restoration of Krupp.

Dreams Can Come True

Suppose at the Morecambe Labour Party Conference the august assembled leaders were to stand before the delegates and say: 'We propose to raise the real wages of all workers by 7s. in the £ by 1955. We propose to increase the supplies of meat by 90 per cent., of butter by 70 per cent., of sugar and tea by 100 per cent., and of clothing by 70 to 80 per cent. We propose to double the housebuilding programme, increase the building of schools by 70 per cent., the training of teachers by 45 per cent., the number of hospital beds by 20 per cent., and the number of doctors by 25 per cent.' A dream? 'And then I woke up'. Yes, but that is what the Communist Party leaders are saying to their party congress at the very same moment as Morecambe. Does not this contrast offer a little nourishing food for thought to the delegates at Morecambe—even if other nourishment is not as abundant in Britain at the moment as one could wish? 'Why, how could we do anything like that? We are not even in power'. True. The workers are most assuredly not in power in Britain; it is a Tory Government. But even if the present Labour Party leadership were returned back to office on their present policy, is there any remotest sign that they are thinking of putting forward even a fraction of such a programme? On the contrary, there is a terrible controversy whether it would not be too bold and audacious to propose nationalising cement and water supplies, and whether it would not be wiser to be 'realist' and stick to a 'sound' programme of consolidating capitalism and calling for more sacrifices. Yes, it is indeed a dream, a fantastic, wildly improbable, excruciatingly comic dream—so long as the assumptions of capitalism continue to be accepted by the labour movement. But it will not be a dream—so soon as the workers act to make it a reality.

'Facing The Facts'

'Communism means chaos'. 'Communism means economic ruin'. 'Communists thrive on economic misery'. How often have we not heard the record? Now listen:

To fix the increase in the level of industrial output for the five years approximately at 70 per cent. . . .

To increase output of light industry and of the food industry not less than 70 per cent. . . .

To increase the national income not less than 60 per cent. . . .

To raise the real wages of factory and office workers by not less than 35 per cent. . . .

To increase the cash incomes and incomes in kind of collective farmers by not less than 40 per cent. . . .

To provide for a broad programme of State housing construction, for which purpose the capital invested will be doubled. . . .

To increase the construction of urban and rural schools approximately 70 per cent. . . .

In accordance with the envisaged development of health protection, education, scientific and cultural and educational institutions, to increase the volume of capital investments for these purposes during the five years by 50 per cent.

(*Directives for the Fifth Five Year Plan*, for submission to the 19th Congress of the C.P.S.U.)

That is Communist leadership speaking to the working people.

Now listen again:

It will be difficult to maintain our standard of life. . . .

We may experience serious shortages in the months ahead. . . .

We need a willingness on the part of all to make sacrifices.

(*Facing the Facts; An Interim Statement of Labour's Home Policy*, Executive Committee of the Labour Party, August, 1952, for submission to the 51st Conference of the Labour Party).

That is present-day Social Democratic leadership speaking to the working people. Is it surprising that there is a Crisis of Social Democracy?

Two Economic Paths

This crisis in the camp of Social Democracy is only the reflection of the deepening crisis of the whole remaining capitalist world, and specifically of the American war camp. Social Democracy is only the moon to the capitalist sun and holds no independent light. The spread of economic deterioration, the failure of Marshall 'recovery', the ruinous effects of the rearmament drive, the downward tendency of productive levels, the ferocious trade

war and imposition of cuts and imports restriction—all these accompany the accelerating economic advance of the countries of socialism and people's democracy. The last quarterly Bulletin of the Secretariat of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, published in Geneva, recorded that industrial production in the Soviet Union and People's Democracies of Eastern Europe continued to expand rapidly in the first quarter of 1952, with an average increase of 20 per cent. on the preceding year, and that consumption standards rose. The same Bulletin recorded that industrial employment and production as a whole stagnated or fell in all the principal Western European countries, unemployment increased, and consumption standards went down.

They Dare Not Face the Facts

All these cardinal facts of the present economic situation in Europe, recorded by the official United Nations economic agency for Europe—which is in fact dominated by the Western powers—might have seemed important for the enlightenment and information of the public in Western Europe, who are seriously concerned about our economic problems. They might have seemed important for consideration through the B.B.C. by the hordes of tame 'economists' who are daily put on tap to lecture the public with wearisome iteration about the so-called 'facts' of the economic situation. In vain. The diligent reader of our 'free' press, if he were not also a reader of the *Daily Worker*, would have searched in vain for this essential information. Nor was it a question of lack of space. *The Times* of September 15 devoted three-quarters of a column to summarising the Bulletin. The summary stated that 'the economic situation in Europe' (*sic*), as described by the Bulletin, revealed 'a gloomy picture'. The summary painstakingly set out the facts recorded concerning the Western European countries. Eastern Europe did not exist. Fleet Street's 'Iron Curtain' closed the journalist's eyes, even when the official Bulletin set out the facts before him. They have reached a stage when they no longer dare face the most elementary facts of the economic situation, for they know the verdict has gone against them. All their 'cold war' tactics, Western blockades, rearmament provocations and trade bans have failed to check the soaring economic advance of the peoples who have won freedom from capitalism. Hence the increasingly violent, reckless demands of the leaders of the war camp for stronger measures.

Crisis of the War Camp

The worsening economic situation has disintegrating effects within the American war coalition. The Lisbon targets for 1952, it is officially declared, cannot be fulfilled. Britain and France officially announce a 'slow down' in the rearmament programme, not for any intelligent change of policy, but because their overstrained economies are incapable of fulfilling the fantastic figures imposed by the American dictators. The American re-building of the West German and Japanese trusts hits Britain hard (Japanese textile exports to British Empire markets have now exceeded those of the United Kingdom). The American offensive deals a body blow at the economies of Britain's colonial primary-producing dollar-earners. Bitter complaints of United States economic policy begin to sound in the highest official quarters beneath all the fulsome flattery of the official alliance. Trade war and military coalition are a troublesome pair to run in harness. American quarters complain of a universal anti-American 'revolt':

There is evidence that a revolt against our economic and monetary policies is brewing in Europe, in Canada, in South Africa and in other parts of the free world. We would probably be faced with open economic warfare if it were not for our economic aids and gifts.

(Philip Cortney, Executive member of the International Chamber of Commerce, *Wall Street Journal*, August 14, 1952.)

Devious attempts are made to smuggle past the American trade bans. Britain carries on some elaborately difficult and expensive trade through intermediary third countries. Belgium presses to extend trade with the Soviet Union; Holland tries to sell ships and tankers to the Soviet Union in the face of public United States reprimands and threats. Indonesia throws out the Government which signed the Military Security Agreement, and replaces it by one which begins tentative approaches to People's China. Ceylon sends an official mission to Peking to negotiate an exchange of rubber for rice. Even Latin America strains against its bonds: Chile elects President Ibanez on a thunderous demagogic programme of denunciation of the treaty with the United States; Argentine, Mexico and Guatemala reject the proffered 'Military Security' Agreements. No wonder the war party in the United States begins to howl for a quick war before economic catastrophe breaks or the coalition falls apart.

Crisis of Atlantic War Strategy

For the cracks and strains in the American war coalition not only reflect the worsening economic situation. They also reflect

a crisis of the whole adventurist Atlantic war strategy. The wars of aggression of the American War Alliance in Korea and South-East Asia have not succeeded. They have spread ruin and destruction, but have brought no sign of victory or of weakening of the resistance of the peoples fighting for their freedom. The imperialists can neither win victory, nor are they willing to admit defeat. Hence their protracted dragging out of the armistice negotiations on transparent pretexts—which they themselves are compelled subsequently to admit officially to have been lies, as on the pretended ‘screening’ of prisoners—while they think out a policy and meanwhile conduct warfare against civilians and prisoners and try out terrorist weapons. According to the latest statement of General Bradley, head of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff in Paris on September 16, the American satellites are to be instructed to prolong their conscription term in future to ‘not less than two years in order to get one year in Korea’—thus suggesting the permanent use of Korea, like the old-time British Army’s use of the North-West Frontier, as the Atlantic military training ground and area for the experimental use of horror weapons. This is, however, a ‘solution’ which is hardly likely to commend itself to the peoples who have to supply the soldiers for a war which has now become the most unpopular war imperialism has ever fought. The war party in the United States frantically demands extension of the war in Eastern Asia as the only ‘solution’; and the ceaseless Yalu raids and sporadic raids on Chinese territory are obvious provocations towards this aim.

Contradictions in the War Camp

This crisis of the Atlantic war strategy is not confined to Eastern Asia. Equally in Europe resistance is visible to the American bellicose plans. The grandiose blueprints of Lisbon and Fontainebleau are in considerable confusion. The six European continental satellites have so far refused the two years’ conscription demanded, leaving Britain in a new kind of ‘glorious isolation’ of suicidal obedience. Even the warrior Churchill is compelled to declare—at last, in July, 1952!—that Britain’s economic problems must now take precedence over rearmament (a conclusion which might have been reached considerably earlier, if the leaders of British policy had been capable of understanding Stalin’s reply to Attlee). American rebuilding of West German militarism arouses alarm, not only among the German people, who want unity and peace, and have learned in experience the

bitter consequences of aggressive war to the East, but equally in France, Belgium, Holland and among the British people, who have also had practical experience where this path ends. Conscious of these contradictions between the former allies, and of their consequent increased bargaining power, the West German militarists in Europe, like the Japanese militarists in Asia, raise their blackmailing terms and begin with indecent haste to unmask their independent aggressive aims for the reconquest of the spoils of the victory of Hitler or of Tojo.

Strategists in Confusion

Even more conspicuous is the wider general crisis of strategy of the American plans for a third world war. The fiasco of the wars of aggression in Eastern Asia, and the impotence of the combined forces of all the imperialist powers of the Grand War Alliance to achieve victory against a few small Asiatic nations, without even the Soviet Union being involved in the war, inevitably gives rise to furious questioning among any American general staff heads or high power experts still capable of consecutive thought. The less insane minority begin to ask themselves what possible rational prospect there is for the more ambitious plans previously set out with such lavish and cocksure arrogance. Where now are all those previous delicious *Colliers Weekly* dreams of the armchair strategist bully about a miraculous push-button war to drop a few atom bombs on the countries of socialism, obliterate some millions of human beings by pulling a lever, and then occupy Moscow and dictate terms. These visions of delight have become pale and faltering after the most recent experiences of the Korean War, in face of the now admitted Soviet scientific and technical superiority in all branches, especially in aircraft and jetplanes. Instead, the fashion has now developed for the most exaggerated panic alarmist statements about the supposed 'inferiority' of strength of the United States, 'qualitative superiority' of the Soviet Union, 'failure' of the rearmament programme, etc.:

Secretary Lovett and other spokesmen of the Defence Department, resisting the ceiling of 46 billion dollars imposed by the house on military spending, presented an alarming account of the state of the nation's state of preparedness in testimony before a senate appropriations sub-committee.

Mr. Lovett said that 'the Russians are outbuilding us—we are falling behind, relatively, in the arms race.'

Secretary of the Army Pace said that the Korean War was eating into reserves of armaments faster than they could be replaced.

Secretary of the Air Force Finletter said, 'We have lost time, time that cannot be replaced.'

General Twining, acting chief of staff of the air force, said that Russia in the last five or six years has outstripped this country in aircraft production, particularly in jet fighters. The general said that qualitatively the Russian air force would equal or surpass ours by 1954.

(Chicago Daily Tribune, June 20, 1952)

The purpose of this familiar type of alarmist statements of service chiefs to an appropriations committee is sufficiently obvious—to increase still higher the already colossal super-rearmament programme of the United States and its satellites. But this path does not lead to any solution. It only increases all the contradictions, and hastens the drive to war.

Negotiation or War

The alternatives in this situation are inescapable. The American-led policy since the end of the war, the policy of the 'cold war' explicitly proclaimed in 1947, the policy of so-called 'containment,' that is, of disruption of the United Nations, economic blockade, super-rearmament, extension of offensive bases, aggressive minor wars of invasion of other states, rearmament of fascism, and daily threats to 'crush communism' by supposed invincible superior force and atomic dictatorship, has completely failed in its supposed objective to lead to the weakening and 'disintegration' of the states of socialism and popular democracy, as prophesied by Kennan. The states of socialism and popular democracy have grown in strength, in sweeping economic and constructive advance, in unity and capacity to defend themselves against attack; while the contradictions, the economic difficulties, the popular discontent with the rearmament and war policy and demand for peace have grown in the countries of the war camp. The illusions of American invincibility have vanished. The choice which this situation presents cannot be concealed. Either to recognise the facts of the situation, to abandon the war policy, to make peace: that is, to recognise the principle of peaceful co-existence of differing social systems, to abandon the aims of 'crushing communism,' to negotiate. Concretely, this means the Four Power Conference on Germany; the cease-fire in Korea; and the preparation of a Five Power Peace Pact and all-round reduction

of armaments. The greatest achievement which the delegates to the Morecambe Labour Party Conference could accomplish in this critical world situation is to help towards this aim. For the alternative, which is now openly proclaimed by the leaders of the war camp in the United States, is to accelerate the drive to war, precisely because the strength of the peace forces in the world is growing, because their difficulties are accumulating, because they recognise that time is not on their side. The alternative is the gambler's throw for war; and in the present hysterical situation among the ruling circles in the United States, this danger is sharp.

Delirium Tremens of Eisenhower and Dulles

Herein lies the significance of the present violent campaign of Eisenhower, Dulles and the Republican platform to throw overboard the previous policy of so-called 'containment', that is, of the 'cold war', as a failure, and embark on an openly aggressive policy to 'liberate' i.e. overthrow by force the states of socialism and people's democracy. The previous idol and magic slogan of 'containment' is now denounced by the Republican platform as 'the negative, futile and immoral policy of containment'. No doubt we may soon expect to hear Senator McCarthy exposing 'containment' as a 'Communist plot' engineered by the notorious Reds Truman and Acheson under orders from the Kremlin. This is not merely election hysteria. It is true that, as the Democratic candidate, Governor Stevenson has admitted, there is 'no fundamental issue between the Republican candidate and myself' on the 'basic direction of foreign policy' (speech at Grand Rapids, September 1). But the open noisy campaign to abandon the hypocritical 'peaceful' and 'defensive' objectives of the previous policy, precisely because they are declared to be merely defensive and therefore reprehensible, is an obvious agitation to endeavour to prepare and work up public opinion for an aggressive third world war. The transparent cover of pretending to propose 'liberation' only by 'peaceful' means cannot deceive the most innocent. There may be some backwoods senator who has read vaguely something about resistance movements in Europe during the war, and imagines that with a supply of a hundred million dollars a general staff can start a 'resistance movement' by pulling a lever. But the staffs themselves, having their own intelligence services, know every well that with dollars they can drop a handful of gangsters and saboteurs in the hope to cause

a few explosions before they are rounded up by the anger of the people, but that they can thereby only increase the unity and determination of the peoples attacked to defend their freedom. The slogan of so-called 'liberation' (i.e. restoration of capitalism, feudalism, fascism) is the slogan of an openly aggressive third world war. This is the aim of reckless desperation now visibly proclaimed by the powerful sections of American finance-capital and militarism which are using Eisenhower as their figurehead. Let the British people, who are still tied by their Government to the American rulers, beware.

British Labour and World Peace

It is against the background of this critical world situation that the problems, the controversies and the responsibilities of the Morecambe Labour Party Conference need to be seen. Britain is still tied by present policies to the American chariot; and the driver of the American chariot is more and more visibly hysterical, insane, goaded to fury at the advance of the progressive forces in the world, banking on catastrophe, steering to engulf its satellites in a third world war which would destroy Britain first of all. Britain is at the same time at the centre of all the contradictions of the American war camp. Britain is simultaneously carrying the heaviest military burden in the world, in proportion to its population, and is the most economically stricken of the major countries. This mad course cannot last, must be changed, if the British people are to survive. And it is the supreme opportunity and responsibility of the British labour movement to lead the way in changing it. If British Labour could indeed speak for Britain, repudiate the American war policy, the atomic bases and Nazi rearmament; demand negotiation, the immediate cease-fire in Korea and a Four Power Conference on Germany; insist on Britain's freedom to trade with Eastern Europe and People's China, and build friendship with the Soviet Union and call for a drastic reduction in the rearmament programme in order to use Britain's resources for constructive needs; then indeed a new era could begin to open in the world situation, and the way would open to solve the home economic problems of the British people, raise living standards and enter on the fight for socialism.

The Fight at Morecambe

Towards these aims the desires of the majority of the membership of the Labour Party, as expressed in the resolutions from the

constituency labour parties on the Morecambe agenda, are obviously pressing. Certainly there is no room for illusions over the treatment likely to be handed out to these resolutions in the present relation of forces in the machine of the Labour Party. But this makes more necessary, not less necessary, the most active and united fight by all those delegates who recognise the necessity for a change of policy. It was the united pressure of the movement from below which compelled, in face of the open resistance of the right wing leadership, the significant August 1 vote in parliament against the ratification of the Bonn Agreement. That vote struck a powerful initial blow against the entire bi-partisan foreign policy since the war. It strengthened the fight against Nazi rearmament in all the Western European countries and the fight for peace throughout the world. If that battle can be carried forward at Morecambe, then, whatever the balance of votes and decisions reached still reflecting the suffocating weight of the old policies, Morecambe can yet signalise a further stage in the advance of all those sections which are fighting for the future of the working class movement, for the national independence of Britain and for peace, and for the aims of socialism. And that battle will assuredly be carried forward beyond Morecambe.

R.P.D.

September 17, 1952.

THE NEW CHINESE PEOPLE

BENJAMIN FARRINGTON

THAT a revolution in the Marxist sense means a moral as well as a material change is no news to Marxists. But it is hard to find words to describe the moral atmosphere of the new China. It is as if some vision of Shelley's had come true and selfishness had been banished from the world.

The visitor is conscious of this enchanted atmosphere from the moment of arrival. As the days go by he begins to discover the secret of the change. In the old feudal China of the last two thousand years of which the Kuomintang was the final phase the perennial oppression of the people had paralysed all the springs of action and produced in the face of every calamity and every misery a mood of 'Nothing can be done.' Now universally it is believed that always something can be done. Universally it is felt that government exists for no other purpose than to find the right thing to do and help people to do it. The buoyancy and purposefulness of life here is plain on every side. And universally credit is given to Chairman Mao and the Communists for bringing about the change. Marxism-Leninism shows what must be done. The Party inspires in the people the collective will to do it.

An example will illustrate how the collective spirit can be mobilised to accomplish special ends. Peking, like other oriental cities, used to tolerate dirt and flies and suffer in consequence endemic plague. To clear up the city was not so easy as it would be in a more highly mechanised society. However, it has been done. Willing hands shifted thousands of tons of ancient garbage from the streets. The D.D.T. and rat and mice extermination squads got to work. And it is now strictly true that scarce a fly nor mosquito can be seen in the town and cholera and smallpox are no more.

Other examples of such special projects demanding at times the concerted labour of several million men are the flood control measures which have already rescued vast areas from periodic ruin. Even more impressive, however, than the overcoming of particular problems is the systematic reorganisation of this vast land carrying one quarter of the population of our globe. We

have been privileged to hear responsible officers of the state expound at length and submit to be questioned on such great themes as land reform and the workings and fundamental institutions of the new democracy. And to conclude this hasty sketch I propose to say a word about the land reform now completed in China proper, though not yet by the national minorities.

Since it now affects three hundred million people it cannot be considered an insignificant event. Nor does the arrival of delegations to study it from Hindustan, Pakistan, Burma and Indo-China lessen its import. China now leads all the Asian peoples. What has happened will happen elsewhere. If, therefore, I describe what I saw in a village of some three thousand souls where we spent the morning and afternoon it is probable that I am describing an epoch-making change.

The village still had dust-tracks and no roads. It still had its ramshackle little houses. Its inhabitants still bore the marks in their bodies of former privation and disease. But it had a roomy and clean co-operative store to market its increased output of grain. It had a village centre containing among other things eight thousand books, where an average of forty readers came every day. It had a popularly elected mayor, who first explained his village to us and then stood up to our questions. It had eleven classes of children at school who danced and sang for us, to whom we lost our hearts. It had a team of workmen putting up a middle-school, now become an imminent need. It had a clinic which had wiped out serious disease in the village, diphtheria for instance being now unknown, and a set of wall charts on personal hygiene, maternity and child care as good as any in the world.

Here was democracy in the fullest sense springing right out of the soil. And with full justice did the faces of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, as well as Chairman Mao, look down from the walls of this Chinese village centre whose shelves were lined with their books. They had foreseen and brought it about that the downtrodden peasants of all lands should become the responsible citizens of a world reborn.

MARGATE T.U.C.

JOHN HORNER

TEN resolutions and one amendment on Wages, Profits and Cost of Living were on the agenda of the Trades Union Congress. They came from some of the most important unions, and undoubtedly reflected the feeling down amongst the rank and file, for every single one of them was critical in one way or another of the General Council or of the Government. They were 'composited' in a way calculated to create the maximum confusion. On the eve of the wages debate, the General Council actually let it be known that they would accept 'Composite 5' which was seconded by the General and Municipal Workers Union. They declared that it carried forward their own statement, but they would oppose 'Composite 6' to be moved by the Electrical Trades Union. The first called upon the General Council to 'reject attempts to restrict justifiable wage increases necessary to ease the burden of rising living costs'. The second asked for a rejection of 'The Tory Government policy of so-called "restraint" or "moderation" designed to secure the with-holding of such wage claims'. Those outside the Congress might be forgiven if they fail to understand the nature of the General Council's objection to the E.T.U. resolution. 'T.U.C. facing both ways'—'Wages Puzzle' stated headlines, but the real nature of their objection became clear during the debate and in the headlines afterwards.

In introducing its forty-two paragraphs, Mr. Lincoln Evans, Chairman of the General Council's Economic Committee, had little to add to the report. But he did fill one omission. He mentioned 'employers'. The report had failed to do so. True, he only said that the employers ought to be reminded that they should not 'stultify' negotiating machinery by refusing 'all reasonable claims'. He added that the unions were entitled to expect a 'little statesmanship' from them. Attacking the E.T.U. resolution he made the startling declaration that 'there is no Tory policy of wage restraint, no Labour policy of wage restraint, there is only a trade union policy of wage restraint'. In his opinion wage-freezing was not a political matter. It was not a question of which Government was in power. He would accept Composite Resolution 5 as an amendment to the report since the report itself 'was

not a policy statement but a directive.' Delegates were left wondering what that last statement meant.

But the delegates who came to move and support Resolution 5 proved a sore disappointment to Mr. Evans. The mover, for U.S.D.A.W., stimulated Congress and shocked the General Council by declaring that his Union would vote both for their own resolution and for that of the E.T.U.; that there was no conflict between the two and it was difficult to understand why the General Council should oppose one while accepting the other. Whatever Lincoln Evans might say about a non-existing Tory wage-freeze, Congress listened to delegate after delegate exposing Tory Party economic policy as one which used Britain's difficulties to strengthen the power of the employers and the City of London at the expense of the working class; as one which sought to place the whole burden of the crisis on to the shoulders of the working people; a policy which was directly aimed at the power of the trade unions.

A wage freeze was a wage freeze no matter how it was disguised. The rank and file of the movement would not touch it again. Even those members of the General Council who left the platform, re-appearing in the hall in the guise of delegates while seeking to help Mr. Lincoln Evans, had to speak in support of wage increases. But one member of the General Council, Mr. Hill of the Boilermakers, declared that those of his fellow members on that body who were prosecuting claims for substantial wage increases and yet seeking to tie the movement to wage restraint, were acting 'immorally'. Another, Mr. Figgins of the N.U.R., cut through the diplomatic phraseology of the platform. Walter Stevens, of the E.T.U., in a speech packed with fact, logical argument, sound economics and, what was missing from every platform speech, working class feeling, attacked Tory economic policy and the arguments in support of it put forward by Mr. Evans. Mr. Evans unfortunately interlarded his reply with personal innuendoes about his opponents, the true sign of a man who has lost the argument. He said that the E.T.U. resolution which called for the rejection of restraint and moderation would mean 'a free-for-all with the weaker going to the wall'. (Mr. Evans failed to read the resolution as 'Tory restraint' and 'Tory moderation' and his enunciation implied no inverted commas). He declared that the strongly organised unions might be able to make headway but, alas, what of the not so strongly organised? Was this fair? He should have continued his argument. Was it fair

for the organised workers to use their strength while so many workers remained unorganised? Wouldn't it be more just for all to start from scratch? Dissolve the trade unions, since they gave their members unfair advantages? And, of course, the tragedy is that that is just where the policy of Mr. Lincoln Evans and the General Council would ultimately lead the trade union movement.

The General Council's victory on the card vote was a hollow one. 'Unions Vote for Wage Restraint' chorused the newspapers. The delegates who voted for Composite Resolution 5 as an amendment to the Council's Report certainly did not vote for wage restraint. It is for Sir William Lawther, Mr. Tanner and Mr. O'Brien, this year's Chairman of the T.U.C., who are leading unions engaged in wage claims ranging from 30 shillings to 40 shillings per week to reconcile their consciences with the employer-type arguments put forward by Mr. Lincoln Evans, but the great mass of delegates and those they represent who supported the honest straight-forward working class arguments of those speakers who pushed aside the verbiage of the General Council and its spokesmen, were in no mood for a return of wage restraint with or without inverted commas.

Mr. Lincoln Evans had his reward. Mr. Churchill commended the T.U.C. The weekly bulletin of the Tory Party quoted with smug approval Mr. Evans' speech. Unfortunately the engineering employers turned a deaf ear to his appeal for 'statesmanship'. For a second time they flatly rejected the Unions' claim. What sort of people did Mr. Evans really think they were?

The time is coming when attempts by the platform to be all things to almost all people in order to try and isolate and thus defeat those heading the progressive forces in Congress—all these subtleties of meaning and platitudinous ambiguities will be blown away. It will not then be a question of Composite Resolution 5 or 6 on the floor of the Winter Garden at Margate. The real opposition to the Tory wage freeze, the fight against this Government's economic policy which is thrusting down the living standards of the workers, will come this winter from the floor of the workshops, factories and shipyards. And so it will prove on the other great cardinal issue which was before the delegates at Margate: the issue of peace or war.

Once again this new confusing tactic was employed of presenting Congress with two composite resolutions containing much in

common. They were taken as amendments to the General Council's report on Rearmament which was put forward by 'realist' Sir Vincent Tewson. It was the Soviet Union, argued Tewson, which made all this rearmament 'an unpleasant necessity'. The composite resolution moved by the A.E.U. called for support for

all measures designed to lessen international tension and to bring about peace, including the introduction through the United Nations, of international agreements to reduce armaments, and to set up and maintain the necessary inspection and control arrangements, to prohibit germ and bacteriological warfare; for the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes; to proceed with the development of backward areas in such a manner as to raise living standards of the people and not to infringe on their right to political self-determination.

This resolution Tewson asked the Congress to reject! Mark you, not on the grounds that there was anything wrong with the resolution—the words themselves were all right. It was what lay beneath them—the 'hidden inferences'—what 'our friends overseas' would think. 'We must stand firm' he declared in his peroration, 'no wavering'. It must have been all very confusing to the new delegates. Joe Scott, in moving the Engineers' resolution, exploded the argument that the Soviet Union is preparing to wage war. He referred to the new Five Year Plan. He, and other speakers, emphasised that the most critical observers in the British Press could not but agree that the new plan demonstrated no preparations for all-out war.

The time came when the paucity of argument, the bankruptcy of ideas of the General Council spokesmen was plain to all. Attempt at reasonable discussion had to be abandoned in place of innuendoes against those delegates who spoke for the ever-growing millions of people who, in the name of common sense and self-preservation, are determined to stop the drift to war. One delegate, incensed by the methods employed, declared 'I have no use for Communism, but the General Council is getting to the position where if certain delegates were to move the Sermon on the Mount, Sir Vincent Tewson would ask the Congress to reject it and cast aspersions on its author'.

The card votes having been duly marshalled for the Report, Congress passed to a resolution which read:

This Congress is opposed to the use of bacteriological weapons and urges Her Majesty's Government through the United Nations Organisation to secure a new international agreement prohibiting their use.

Mr. Deakin, as Chairman, ruled that the resolution be not put, on the grounds that the previous resolution which had been defeated, contained a reference to bacteriological warfare. The Association of Scientific Workers, whose resolution it was, having successfully appealed to Congress, the mover went to great lengths to explain that the resolution meant nothing more than it said—that it had no ‘hidden meaning’. The General Council could find not a single delegate ready openly to oppose it. Thus Sir Vincent Tewson found himself alone in asking Congress to reject it. It was a shameful speech. He said that had it not been for the wave of propaganda which had recently swept this country, propaganda which, he said ‘appeared to have been effectively disposed of by the chopsticks of the Red Dean’, the resolution would never have been before Congress. He asked Congress to throw it out. The vote was about to be taken when an old plumber mounted the rostrum. He said he was not concerned with the hidden inferences. In the last war his son had been crippled by steel. Germ warfare meant unrestricted, limitless death. He was against it. He turned his back on Congress and facing the platform, said to the Chairman ‘Are you for it?’—to Sir Vincent, ‘Are you prepared to vote for germ warfare?’ The two general unions and the National Union of Mineworkers in a regular drill combined their card votes for the platform. But they were alone. The resolution was carried against the General Council. It was the conscience of Congress speaking.

How slender is the thread with which the present leadership still seeks to bind Congress was shown during the debate on de-nationalisation and social ownership. Expressing support for those unions who were directly concerned, and who were opposing the Tory Government’s de-nationalisation policy, the resolution welcomed the Labour Party’s declaration that it would extend social ownership, and called upon the General Council to formulate proposals for other industries and services, particularly those now subject to monopoly control. After they had been submitted to Congress, these proposals should be presented for inclusion in Labour’s General Election programme. Coming as it did, within a few weeks of the Labour Party Conference this was of extreme significance, a significance lost on none. Despite what the resolution said, the Labour Party Executive Committee’s proposals at Morecambe will contain little reference to an extension of social ownership. Congress was therefore presented with an astonishing display of timidity on the part of the General Council. Of

course there was nothing in the resolution that anyone could take exception to, other than the fact that they were required to submit proposals to *next* Congress, but still they were afraid that if the resolution were put to the vote it might be defeated, and this they wanted to avoid. Would the National Union of Public Employees who had moved the resolution remit it to the General Council without a vote? Mr. Geddes, of the Post Office Workers, spent so long explaining why the resolution should not be put to the vote, and why in any case they could not do anything in twelve months even if it were carried, that one delegate remarked that in the time occupied by his speech, plans for at least two of the industries concerned could have been produced. Mr. Bryn Roberts, for the N.U.P.E., insisted on the vote. So flustered was Mr. Deakin that he was guilty of a piece of bad chairmanship unprecedented even at the T.U.C. Amid a pandemonium of cries of 'order', one delegate shouted that he should consult Citrine's A.B.C. of Chairmanship. The vote was overwhelmingly in favour of the resolution. On reflection many delegates expressed concern at what lay beneath the General Council's plea for time. It demonstrated that in that leadership there is no acceptance of the urgent need of getting rid of the Tories, no feeling that a General Election can be forced and that the Labour movement must be ready to go to the country with a clear-cut, vigorous programme of more socialisation. And along with this it demonstrated that when the miners supported a progressive resolution, Congress swept that resolution home.

This year the stage machinery creaked and groaned louder than ever. The wires were plain for all to see. The General Council is finding it more and more difficult to control the growing number of 'unruly delegations'. Yet the men working this stage machinery pose as the 'hard-headed realists'. In the cynical words of the *Observer's* Labour correspondent,

In the debate on rearmament the task of the General Council was in keeping the main body from thundering blissfully down the disused road of the brotherhood of man . . . the stampede was checked by Mr. Lincoln Evans. He cut through the rose-tinted fog. . . . *Even so it was a near thing.*

The card vote hides the differences in the delegations. The sonorous intonings of Mr. Lincoln Evans and Sir Vincent hide the differences in the General Council, differences which this year were very real indeed. The right-wing leadership, still hanging

On the Third Anniversary of the



Joining the Parade (Paper Cut)

Chiu Yen

ese People's Republic . . .



Picking Fruits (Paper Cut)

Chiu Yen

on to control, were presented with mounting difficulties. The delegates would stand for no flirting with the wage freeze. Therefore some complex formula had to be found to mask the General Council's allegiance to Tory policy in the disguise of support for 'reasonable' wage claims. At the same time the attempt had to be made to isolate the advocates of Peace and Pay, the only alternative policy to Cold War and the Wage Freeze. The measure of success enjoyed by the right wing is in direct ratio to the lack of unity amongst its opponents. There are millions of men and women in the trade union branches who want negotiations now, rather than a common death in a future war. Unity in the trade union branches behind the sort of policy put forward by those who spoke against further re-armament, against a further depression of working class standards, would mean defeat for those whose policies bring commendations from Mr. Churchill and his party. For the task remains to resolve the contradiction in the movement of wage demands coupled with continued support for a foreign policy which makes their realisation impossible. One or the other must give way. It was this lack of unity and the resulting confusion which was used to hide the fact that at Margate the progressive forces in the Trade Union movement did indeed demonstrate their new strength. The misgivings and hopes of ordinary rank and filers found voice at this year's T.U.C. Despite the slurs and innuendoes from the platform there came from the body of the hall opposition to German re-armament, to Eisenhower's mad speech, to American domination of these islands, for peace in Korea and Malaya. Men and women from key sections of industry spoke for friendship and trade with the Soviet Union and China. It does move. A year ago a resolution on East-West trade was defeated amid sneers. This year there were no sneers from the hall as the resolution was carried unanimously. This year's Congress was marked by the quiet and sober way in which delegates listened to the opponents of the General Council's policy. At Margate it was the platform alone who ran the risk of a barrage of interruptions from all over the hall.

In the *Daily Herald* on the morning of the wages debate Low depicted Lincoln Evans dressed in a white robe with bell, book and candle ready to exorcise some unspecified spirit from the Winter Garden. Was it the Spirit of Congress Past? Then he met with no success: for the spirit of the British workers' militant past was certainly moving through the delegations. Was he required to banish the spirit of the lively present-day trade unionists

who made the running at Margate? If so the debates day after day showed his lamentable failure. It was from the floor at Margate that the real spirit of the British working class which Lincoln Evans so unsuccessfully sought to kill, made its voice heard and the General Council caught a fearful glimpse of the Spirit of Congress Yet to Come. The *Observer's* correspondent was nearer to the truth than he knew. It was a near thing at Margate. Now working class unity in the factories and trade union branches, in the pits and miners' lodges can yet transform the Trade Union Congress into a powerful force for progress which will turn our country away from the Tory path of disaster and lead the British working class to a Socialist Britain in a world at peace.

LABOUR MONTHLY SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *United Kingdom, 12 months, 18s. post free; \$3.00 in U.S.A. and Canada (\$3.50 if first class mail); elsewhere overseas, 19s. post free.*

LABOUR MONTHLY BY AIRMAIL: *To non-European countries (including Hongkong) except as below, post free: Single copy 3s. 6d.; a year's subscription 42s.*

To China (except Hongkong), Australia, New Zealand, Japan and the Philippines, post free: Single copy 4s.; a year's subscription 48s. To Aden, Algeria, Egypt, Iran, Iraq and Syria, post free. 3s. per copy; a year's subscription 36s.

WEST GERMAN FOCUS OF WAR

QUAESTOR

ONCE again the Soviet Government, in its Note of August 23 to Britain, France and the U.S.A., has offered a way out of the seven years' deadlock over Germany which has divided that country, revived the strength of German monopoly capitalism and aggressive militarism, and maintained the threat to world peace. It will be useful to recall this year's transactions.

In the Note of March 10 the U.S.S.R. suggested early negotiations on a peace treaty with an all-German Government, offering draft points as a basis of discussion. These were (i) political guarantees of liberty for all Germans, apart from convicted criminals, enabling them to build 'an independent, democratic, peace-loving State'; (ii) national armed forces such as would be necessary for the defence of such a State; (iii) withdrawal of foreign armed forces and their bases within a year of the treaty, and a German undertaking not to enter into coalitions or alliances directed against any of its adversaries in the last war; (iv) recognition of the frontiers laid down at Potsdam. The Note offered to discuss any other suggestions that might be made.

In all their comments, official and unofficial, the capitalist ruling class of the U.S.A. and Great Britain rejected these proposals, making clear that what they wanted, on the contrary, was a West German state under their control, run by militarists and big business, and prepared for a war of revenge on Eastern Europe. In Notes on March 25 and again on May 13, they insisted that before there could be any question of a peace treaty, there should be an investigation of political conditions throughout Germany, as a preliminary to elections there. Moreover, any government formed as a result of such elections must be free to 'associate itself with other nations for peaceful purposes'—which meant, as was underlined by the British and American press, compulsion to join the North American-dominated Atlantic Treaty Organisation (see *Germany and Peace in the May Labour Monthly*).

The Soviet Government thereupon sent a further Note, on May 24, which drew attention to these purposes of the Western Powers,

particularly the preparations for a separate military agreement with Western Germany. This would make foreign occupation permanent, legalise the reconstitution of an army led by Hitler's generals and prevent all hopes of a peaceful, unified Germany. It proposed that *joint* discussion of the questions of a peace treaty, of the unification of Germany and of the formation of an all-German government begin without further delay on the basis of the principles of demilitarisation, denazification and democratisation laid down at Potsdam. It agreed that the four Powers could appoint a commission to verify political conditions existing in Germany.

How did the Western Powers reply? By signing at Bonn, two days later, a military agreement with Western Germany which in fact did (i) set up a new Wehrmacht under Hitler's generals; (ii) perpetuate their occupation of Western Germany; (iii) reserve Anglo-Franco-American right to intervene in German internal affairs; (iv) oblige Western Germany to remain in the American bloc; (v) laid down that a united Germany must also be 'integrated within the European community'; (vi) expressly kept open the question of Germany's frontiers. The Anglo-American press made it quite plain that 'the new arrangements harden the division of Europe' and that as a result 'in the months ahead the tension between the two halves of Germany will increase', in the words of *The Times* on May 26 and 28 (see *The Crime at Bonn* in the July *Labour Monthly*).

In a Note sent more than six weeks later (July 10) the Western Powers once again offered a discussion confined merely to the technical question of the composition and functions of the proposed investigating committee. Moreover, to show its contempt for the Soviet offers of a general settlement, the United States Senate on July 1 had voted to ratify the Bonn treaty, and on August 1 the Tory majority in the House of Commons carried ratification by 293 to 253.

The new Soviet Note of August 23 provided once more an example of that dogged persistence in the cause of peace, in the teeth of apparently invincible prejudice and hostility, for which Soviet diplomacy is famous.

It underlined that the effect of the Bonn agreement is to 'perpetuate and aggravate the partition of Germany'. Once again this

has been declared and confirmed by *The Times* itself (in a leading article on September 8). The French and West German parliaments, it says, have yet to ratify 'the arrangements that will lead to German rearmament and a hardening of the division of Germany'! And the *Manchester Guardian*, which nowadays voices Tory opinion to the right, if anything, of *The Times*, had already admitted as much in its first comment on the Soviet Note (August 25), when it said that the first guarantee demanded by the Western Powers for any reunion of Germany is that 'freedom in the Western sense and not the Communist sense must exist throughout the country'. But what is 'freedom in the Western sense', if we turn to real life in Western Germany? It is freedom for monopoly capitalism: freedom for the State Department to interfere in foreign labour movements: freedom for the Police to break up peaceable mass demonstrations and harry the Communist Party: freedom for the great German landowners to retain their estates, for the Nazi generals to return to military posts and for Nazi gangsters to organise under new names. Of course to expect that the German Democratic Republic should go back to this—take the land away from the peasants again, and the big industries from the workers: deprive the trade unions of their part in planning and control: lift the ban on Fascist and war propaganda—is ridiculous. And the Bonn agreement gives the Western Powers permanent power to prevent the West German workers from imposing real destruction of militarism and Nazism, and thus making possible *really* free German elections.

The Soviet Note reminded the Western Powers that it was of the right to do this that the Potsdam Agreement spoke. So far from that Agreement having 'proved to be impracticable' (as the Western Powers stated in their Note of July 10), in this essential respect it has never even been tried. To avoid this central and damning point, the Western Note had pretended that when the Soviet Government referred to Potsdam, it was proposing to re-establish Four-power control in Germany—a grotesque suggestion, but which also served to distract attention from the unpleasant fact that in reality the Bonn Agreement does put Western Germany permanently under military control by the United States, through the 'special rights' granted to the American, French and British Governments.

Of this the Soviet Note also reminded the Western Powers. When they talk of an all-German Government having 'freedom of

action', it points out, they ignore the fact that such freedom is impossible

so long as there is the separate Bonn 'agreement,' from Article 7 of which it directly follows that the very possibility of establishing a united Germany is made conditional on the absolute retention by the Governments of the three western powers of all the privileges that deprive Germany of State sovereignty and independence.

This applies not only to internal questions, but also to Germany's foreign policy. The Soviet proposals for barring Germany from joining any military alliance against any of its former adversaries

in no way impairs Germany's right to associate itself with other nations for peaceful purposes. But it does preclude Germany's association with such groupings as, for instance, the North Atlantic bloc, which pursues aggressive aims and the activities of which threaten to bring on another world war.

In fact, as we have seen, the Western Powers have laid down that membership of the bloc is an *obligatory* condition for any union of Germany.

The Soviet Note put forward a new proposal for the composition of the commission that should investigate the existence in Germany of conditions for free general elections. It should consist of Germans, appointed by Germans—say, of the People's Chamber of the German Democratic Republic and the parliament of Western Germany. Moreover its first aim ought to be to see whether the Potsdam decisions to demilitarise, denazify and democratise Germany had been carried out. There is evidence that these proposals caused acute embarrassment to the Western politicians. Most preferred to ignore them: the few that mentioned them could only uneasily say that 'it would be a fruitless and unhelpful game' (*Manchester Guardian*, August 25). But what were the Western Powers proposing, then, if not to see how free the mass of the German people are to speak their minds, undominated by militarism and Nazism? Silence is the answer.

In conclusion, the Soviet Note proposed a four-Power conference 'at a very early date, and in any case not later than October', to discuss (i) preparation of peace treaty with Germany (ii) formation of an all-German government (iii) holding of free all-German elections, and the composition, functions and authority of the commission to investigate the existence in Germany of conditions for such elections (iv) time limits for the withdrawal of

occupation forces. Representatives both of the German Democratic Republic, and of the German Federal Republic, should be invited to participate in the discussion of relevant questions.

Three weeks after delivery of the Soviet Note, Foreign Office officials were still 'declining to guess' when a reply would be sent (*Manchester Guardian*, September 13). Just as they dragged out their replies previously until the Bonn treaty had been signed, so now the Western Powers obviously hope to get its ratification completed before finally reducing negotiation to a sham.

Meanwhile Alfred Krupp received nearly £50 millions compensation, with full control over his shipyard, shipping and land companies; the R.A.F. is to re-train former Luftwaffe pilots; 'Deutschland Uber Alles' was sung officially in Berlin for the first time since the war on September 7; the West German Minister for Refugees, Lukaschek, has declared that the lost Eastern territories 'will become German again' (*Manchester Guardian*, August 29), his colleague, Seehofer, Minister of Transport, said the Czechoslovakian border districts could be 're-won by peaceful means' (*ibid*, September 9) and the demand has been made for the return of Gdansk (Danzig) to Germany. On September 8 the Bavarian Premier Ehard revived the idea in 1948 of General Clay—that the Western Powers should by force 'clear a corridor to Berlin' (*ibid*). In his own territory—it is only now revealed (*Manchester Guardian*, September 9)—1,900 Jews living in a camp were attacked by his police on May 28 with yells of: 'The crematoria are still there', 'The gas chambers are waiting for you', etc. The American C.I.C. land forces in Europe, General Eddy, hopes that next autumn German units will be ready to take part in manoeuvres (*Daily Telegraph*, September 10). In short, the re-arming of German aggressive militarism goes on, while in Downing Street the diplomats laugh in their sleeve.

British Labour, by demanding that Britain be pulled out of the war preparations, by insisting on a final break with American-dominated 'bipartisan' foreign policy, by pledging itself to repudiate the Bonn Agreement, can make them laugh on the other side of their faces, and save world peace.

U.S. 'COPS AND ROBBERS'

NEIL STEWART

THE scene is the straggling village of Babice, in Czechoslovakia. The time, one hot summer afternoon in July, 1951.

In the village hall four members of the village council discuss local affairs. The discussion was abruptly interrupted by two men who burst into the room. In their hands they carried sub-machine guns. Brutally, in cold blood, they opened fire. Three of the councillors were shot dead, the other seriously wounded. The bandits hastily withdrew before the alarmed villagers knew what had taken place.

A couple of days later the police cornered the killers in a wheat field. After a short gun battle they were captured. Some time later the murderers and twelve accomplices were brought to trial. Then it was revealed that they were terrorists trained in American camps in Bavaria and sent back to their own country to commit murder and sabotage. The key man in the conspiracy was Ladisla Maly, who had organised a group of gangsters, supplied them with arms and funds. In this he was helped by a village priest. Maly was killed in the final clash with the police. His gang had committed a number of crimes, including assault and robbery, before they were caught. Seven of the prisoners were condemned to death, the rest to terms of imprisonment.

But did this really happen? Does the United States subsidise gangsters to commit murder? Or was the Babice affair a frame-up of some harmless opponents of the 'people's democracy'? These are the sort of suspicions that are in the minds of many honest people in the Western countries.

Many people believed a State Department statement of December, 1951, which vigorously denied that the United States interfered in the internal affairs of other countries. United States policy, it declared, was purely defensive, and its relations with other countries were carried on according to normal standards of international contact. Other, more cynical, people had other opinions. The well-known American journalist, James Reston, *New York Times* correspondent and Pulitzer prize-winner, writing in his paper on December 9, 1951, made the following comment on the State Department protest:

Really the only result of this statement was to confuse the American people. The Russians know we are playing cops and robbers back of the Iron Curtain. So do the satellites and our allies. About the only people

who do not know—and they must suspect it—are the American people, many of whom do not know anything about the bare-knuckle aspect of the cold war.

A few months later another well-known American journalist gave further details of how to play 'cops and robbers':

No Government official will admit it, but we are training men to be spies, saboteurs, specialists in the tougher forms of psychological warfare. They are being taught to slip into the Russian fabric on their own to do some unravelling. They learn to blow bridges, railroad trains and war plants. They are taught to use all types of weapons, both U.S. and foreign. They become expert map readers. They learn secret methods of communication so that they can get back word of what they learn. They merge into hostile populations and spread disquieting rumours, help to frame up Russian stooges so that their own superiors will lose confidence in them. They locate and help resistance leaders.

One of our men can, for another example, walk up to a key building in a hostile country and stick some gooey plastic material on a wall—picking an inconspicuous place. What looks like a harmless pencil is then stuck in the plastic, after which the agent walks away. In a few hours, or if he wishes, in a few days, the building will blow up. . .

This candid piece of information was written by Anthony H. Leviero, in *Nation's Business* published by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in April, 1952.

In its attempts to overthrow by violence the Governments of the people's democracies, the Government of the United States is using all methods short of war, including murder, sabotage and terror. In addition, it has organised a vast propaganda campaign of terror by the spoken and written word, by pamphlet, broadcast and rumour. The outlines of this campaign have been described by Leviero, writing in the *New York Times* on December 12, 1951:

While much must be left unsaid for security reasons, it is possible to define the three types of propaganda—'white,' 'black' and 'grey'—and to say that Americans and co-operative foreigners in critical areas are practising all three.

White propaganda is straightforward overt action, such as the broadcasts of the Voice of America or pamphlets bearing the imprint of the State Department or other United States agency.

Black propaganda conceals or falsifies the source, and may include violence, planting false rumours, the manufacture and propaganda of scandals, and other activities designed to sow confusion and distrust.

Grey propaganda is employed in the twilight zone between white and black. In this field vagueness is preferred. No effort is made to develop credence by crediting a particular source of a pamphlet or activity; nor is any attempt made to conceal completely or forge the source.

Recent black operations are covered by security regulations. . . .

Since 1951 this aggressive policy, hitherto unheard of in relations between civilised states, has been made law of the land. The Mutual Security Act, which created the Mutual Security Agency, contained a clause making money available for the organisation of sedition in the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. It was proposed as an amendment to the Act by Congressman Charles C. Kersten and authorised the sum of \$100 million to be used to finance 'selected persons who are *resident in* or escapees from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania or Albania, either to form such persons into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, or for *other purposes*.'

The Soviet Government sent a Note to the State Department pointing out the significance of the Kersten amendment and remarking that such a law 'cannot be regarded as other than an aggressive act aimed at further complicating the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union and aggravating the international situation.' The State Department's half-hearted attempt to deny the Soviet accusation was made to look foolish by Kersten's statement during the debate in Congress on the law, and reported in the *Congressional Record* of October 20, 1951:

In this cold war against communism, we must do more than merely try to contain it. In that provision to the mutual security law which authorises the use of up to \$100 million to aid selected persons who are escapees from or resident in the Iron Curtain countries to form them into national units or for other purposes, we have the opportunity to go on the offensive in the cold war. Let us make some trouble for Joe Stalin in his own backyard.

Then Kersten added:

To say that terror would play no part in a liberation movement in Eastern Europe is to be utterly unconversant with what constitutes a liberation movement.

The following February, Kersten organised a conference in Washington, attended by 500 people, to discuss 'psychological and unconventional warfare' programmes. At a meeting with the press before the conference, the *New York Herald Tribune* of February 6, 1952, reported him as follows:

The United States has a plan 'under way' to spend 'tens of millions of dollars' to help Communist-dominated peoples resist their oppressors, Rep. Charles C. Kersten, R. Wis., said last night. The money will come from the special \$100 million fund included in last year's Mutual Security Act at Mr. Kersten's suggestion. He said that the Government has 'advanced pretty far in one phase of the plan'.

Possibly the most significant and most cynical comment on the Mutual Security Act and the Soviet protest came from the Washington Correspondent of *The Times*, when he remarked on the State Department answer to the Soviet accusation that the Act meant interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union and the other countries mentioned:

These are fine words, but the intention of the portion of the Act in dispute was somewhat differently explained by Representative Kersten of Wisconsin who, as he introduced it into Congress and had it accepted there, should know what he is talking about. He said it 'provides a method whereby the United States can render aid for underground liberation movements in Communist countries.' (December 22, 1951). An equally cynical leader on the same day remarked that . . . everything goes to show that, at the least, more care should be taken in drafting such clauses. There is much to be said for traditional discretion in these matters.

In the January after the Mutual Security Act was passed, the Soviet representative at the United Nations General Assembly presented a draft resolution on the definition of aggression—one of the main points was organisation of armed bands and their support on the territory of another State. This was rejected by the American majority on the Assembly, and obviously for the good reason that the United States Government was engaged in this very activity.

It is significant that the Mutual Security Agency is headed by Averell Harriman, a Wall Street banker, partner in the firm of Brown, Harriman & Co., associates of Morgans and Rockefellers. He long dealt with the German end of their business and was one of the authors of the Dawes and Young plans for loans to Germany after World War One. The European representative of the Agency is William H. Draper, Wall Street banker and member of the firm of Dillon, Read. In 1945 he was chief of the Economic Division of the Control Council in Germany, and economic adviser to McCloy, U.S. High Commissioner in Germany, and one-time counsel for I. G. Farben, giant German chemical trust which make the Zyklon gas used in Nazi extermination camps. In his book *All Honourable Men*, James Stewart Martin, once head of the Decartelisation Bureau in Germany, describes how Draper consistently hampered him in his attempts to split up the great German cartels.

But behind the Agency, like a giant spider in a web, sits the National Security Council, nerve centre of American imperialism's cold war policy. Its members include the President himself, the

heads of the Services, the Secretary of Defence and the head of the Central Intelligence Agency. This latter organisation was substantially reorganised in 1948, on the recommendation of a select committee headed by Allen Dulles. This man was head of the American Office of Strategic Services in Switzerland during the war, and the trial of Rajk, the Hungarian traitor, in 1949, revealed that from an early date he had been engaged in infiltrating spies into the people's democracies. It was on his advice that in 1949 President Truman signed the Central Intelligence Act, commonly known as the Spy Bill. For security reasons Congress was not informed on many of the details of the various provisions of the Act. It included stipulations for the safeguard of United States 'military secrets,' and for infiltrating agents into foreign countries. It enabled foreign spies to be recruited by waiving existing immigration laws in the case of foreigners 'useful to the furtherance of the national intelligence mission.' It put the powers of the C.I.A. far ahead of those of the intelligence sections of the United States forces.

So sweeping were the powers granted that the *New York Times* warned that it was a 'a legislative catch with very broad . . . implications, which under improper administration or on the spur of hysteria could lead to grave abuses of freedom.' In the middle of 1950 it was given as director a hundred-per-cent cold war enthusiast, in the shape of Lieutenant-General Walter Bedell Smith, who had previously held high commands in the United States army. He had just returned to Washington after being Ambassador in Moscow. A Washington correspondent of the *New York Herald Tribune*, written on March 15, 1951, after Bedell Smith had been at work for a year, noted that 'his tour of duty in Russia was particularly valuable' to fit him for his present post—a significant comment on the aims of United States diplomats.

According to the knowledgeable James Reston, writing in the *New York Times* on December 8, 1951, the C.I.A. is housed in twenty-two buildings in Washington. Vast sums have been secretly appropriated to it, and Reston remarks: 'Considerable sums were made available to this agency, but even Representative John Tabor, Republican of New York, who knows what has happened to every cent appropriated by the United States Government since the days of President McKinley, was not told who got what or why.'

In addition to its underground sabotage activities directed against the people's democracies, the United States is attempting

to seduce intellectuals away from the countries of Eastern Europe, partly with the aim of depriving these countries of skilled scientists, but also with the intention of providing recruits for the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation armed forces. In March, 1952, President Truman earmarked \$4,300,000 for this task. Commented the *Christian Science Monitor*:

What is now envisaged is both the enlistment of intellectual escapees in the cause of the Free West and recruitment of some of this manpower into the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation's western defence force.

The *New York Herald Tribune* of April 22, 1952, noted that of the refugees brought to the United States by the International Refugee Committee, '163 have been placed in important jobs directly connected with the nation's security.' In addition to this step, the recruitment of *émigrés* into armed national units under United States command has been carried out. The British journalist, Clifford Hume, writing in the *Sunday Times* on June 25, 1950, reported:

All the recruits will be single men between 18 and 25, picked for their familiarity with the terrain and topography of 'certain countries of Europe', and for their knowledge of the languages, customs, habits, psychology, philosophy and other characteristics of these countries . . . The men must give up allegiance to their native countries—a formality for the stateless persons—and swear fidelity to the United States. They will be under full military discipline and watched continuously. Any man found disloyal will be court-martialled and shot.

The type of recruit brought into the United States army under this scheme was indicated in an article in the *New York Herald Tribune* of December 10, 1951:

Pvt. T—, thirty-two, is a former first lieutenant in the Estonian army, and served six years in the infantry. In World War II he served on the Eastern front and was a guerrilla after the Russians occupied Estonia. . .

Pvt. Ernest Smitka's father was a colonel in the German army. . . He said he fought the Russians for nine months as an irregular. . .

'Liberation, not Containment' is the policy now openly advocated by John Foster Dulles, one of the architects of United States foreign policy. This is just another way of demanding war against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. It is certainly clear that Washington's preparations for the murder of peace are already well advanced. But whether the American-German bankers and industrialists and the sons of German colonels will be able to carry out these plans is another matter. As long as the peoples of the world are made aware of the plans and intentions of the warmongers, then peace is invincible.

NIKOLA VAPTSAROV

[Ten years ago the great poet and the revolutionary of Bulgaria, Nikola Vaptsarov, was executed by the fascist police. We gladly print this appreciation of his work.—Ed., L.M.]

THE work of this Bulgarian poet will give readers in the West an invaluable insight into the revolutionary movements of our time. Vaptsarov deliberately identified himself with the working class movement. He voluntarily accepted the limitations of such a choice in the feudal and fascist conditions of life in Bulgaria between the two world wars. After graduating from the naval college at Varna, he worked as a mechanic on a steamship, as a stoker in a paper mill and on the railways, and in a municipal slaughter house. He knew what unemployment meant. His passionate faith in the power of the working class to build a new order was based on personal experience.

It is impossible to separate the poet from the revolutionary in Vaptsarov's work. His emotional reaction to the crude exploitation of the worker in pre-war Bulgaria was informed and guided by his study of the works of Marx during student days at Varna. Vaptsarov joined the Communist Party when 22 years of age. In 1942, when 33 years of age, he was executed for his underground activities. He told his judges, 'My illegal work was directed only against the German troops and their Bulgarian helpers . . . in the full consciousness that I served my homeland as its true son.' A few hours before his death he wrote:—

The fight is hard and pitiless.
The fight is epic, as they say.
I fall. Another takes my place.
Why single out a name?
After the firing squad — the worms.
Thus does the simple logic go.
But in the storm we'll be with you
My people, for we loved you so.

He experienced 'life with the mask and greasepaint off,' and likened it to 'a savage dog snarling.' In his poem 'Duel' he addresses the 'old degenerate venomous life' of feudal and capitalist oppression:—

We have come to close grips,
You and I have locked hands.
From my heart the blood drips
And you weaken, what then?
One of us will be overthrown,
One will be beaten, —
And *you* are the one!

But Vaptsarov is not merely a poet of revolt. Otherwise his work would have less significance today either for his own people or for the peoples of the West. There was nothing negatively destructive in his personality. But unless we realise the passionate intensity of his revolt we miss the permanent value of his affirmations, and the positive constructive influence he exerts in Bulgaria today. Here are a few verses from his poem 'History':

History, will you mention us
In your faded scroll?
We worked in factories, offices, —
Our names were not well known...
Was it a life worth noting,
A life worth digging up?
Unearthed, it reeks of poison,
Tastes bitter in the cup...
We died like flies in autumn.
The women mourned the dead.
Turned their lament to singing —
But only the wild grass heard...
At home our fathers taught us:
'So shall it always be.'
But we scowled back and spat upon
This fool's philosophy...
And life, showing us no mercy,
With heavy brutish paw
Battered our hungry faces.
That's why our tongue is raw.
That's why the poems I'm writing
In hours I steal from sleep,
Have not the grace of perfume
But brief and scowling beat...
Tell them our story simply
To those we shall not see.
Tell those who will replace us —
We fought courageously.

During his lifetime Vaptsarov's work was known to few people. Countless barriers were raised, up to Liberation Day, September

9, 1944, between the people and those like Vaptsarov who lived to serve their best interests. But during the last seven years his work has gripped the Bulgarian people. In July this year the tenth anniversary of his death was marked by remarkable and largely spontaneous celebrations. The group of writers from Sofia who attended the celebrations at his birthplace, Bansko, in the Pirin mountains, found villages, houses and streets decorated with portraits and quotations, and met scores of impromptu meetings on the journey from Sofia. The positive side of Vaptsarov's work explains its influence. His poem 'We shall build' is typical. He writes of the achievements of man:—

We have suspended the cables,
Through which submissively flows —
Yes, our own blood flows through the pylon cables
Powering life...
We've burrowed through rock with our nails,
Tunnels through granite we've driven.
We've girded the earth with steel rails,
In its bowels theres' nothing lies hidden.
Aerials pattern the sky, where on high
Skyscraper summits are thrust in mist
And in space higher still
Roar the ravens of steel.

He comments:—

But life sweeps and drags us along
While we gaze at it, dumbly indifferent.

He uses 'concrete and steel' as symbols of the material basis on which the new life will be built, in which it will no longer be a 'sin in the heart' to 'love our fellow men,' using the word 'love' in its full meaning of just human relations, without which today the word has little social significance.

We build a plant, an enormous plant
With walls of concrete and steel!
Men and women,
We, the people,
Shall build a plant for life.

In 'Factory,' he writes:—

They have thrown in the dustbin
The sky and its dreams...
You, factory, still seek to blind us
With smoke and soot, layer on layer.
In vain! for you teach us to struggle...
And one heart within you tirelessly
Beats with a thousand hearts.

In Vaptsarov the poet and the worker, the revolutionary and the citizen of the new order, are fully integrated. Nothing can disturb his faith in the happy ordering of the life of man. Without this faith, for him there is nothing, only decay and death.

But look, suppose you took — how much?
A single grain from this my faith
Then would I rage...
For what of me would there remain?
After the theft I'd be distraught.
To put it plainly and more directly —
After the theft I would be nought.

Hence the fierceness of Vaptsarov's anger against all that degrades man. Many of his poems are eloquent comment on Spinoza's words, 'He who would assist others in common conversation will refer sparingly to the vices of men, and will talk largely of human virtue and power, and the way by which man may be made perfect.' In 'Cinema' Vaptsarov deals with a Hollywood-type film announced as 'A human drama.' Against a stagey background of 'sleek limousine' and 'nightingales in the wood,' John and Greta, 'our hero and heroine' carry on their 'lustfully greasy' romance:

Stop it!
Where is our fate here? Where is the drama?
Where am I, tell me?
Ready to shoot, the explosive time
Presses a gun against our spine.

He continues, 'Our love arises at work—amid smoke, amid soot, and machines. Then comes the grey life, the struggle for bread... That's how it is.'

And there is the drama!
Everything else — is a lie!

One of the Comrades in prison with Vaptsarov before his death was Kladen Issaev, who gives a brief significant item in the story of Vaptsarov's last days. 'He was absorbed in work day and night. He had no time for personal life. When he heard of the death of my small son, he was moved and for a long time he asked me about it, and gave me consolation.'

What kind of a man was this, who has 'no personal life' and yet 'gave me consolation'? We know Vaptsarov had an 'insatiable urge to serve life,' and that he 'found himself' in serving others. We are moving to a period in history where 'personal life' can

only develop in a community wide as the world, from which the petty egotisms of class and race are eliminated. As a revolutionary and as a poet Vaptsarov belongs to the socialist future.

To die, when the earth is beginning
To shake off its slough of wrong,
When millions are being re-born,
Is a song, yes, that is a song.

The translations of Vaptsarov's poems are by Peter Tempest.

FROM THE LABOUR MONTHLY OF 25 YEARS AGO

MONDISM

The Chairman's address was a plea for 'Industrial Peace.' Nothing more or less. Beyond its gratuitously patronising insults to our Russian comrades, it contained nothing worth noting. The whole of the more responsible capitalist Press hailed the address with delight, and the passage they fixed on is the same in every case:

We all know — employers as well as trade unionists — that the vexatious, toilsome, and difficult period through which we are passing is a transitional period. Much fuller use can be made under these conditions of the machinery for joint consultation and negotiation between employers and employed. We have not reached the limits of possible development in this direction.

That quotation — the decisive part of Hicks's speech — is the swan song of the 'left wing.' . . . Under cover of the Edinburgh Congress (and it was no coincidence that Messrs. Clynes and Brownlie, of 1919 'Produce More and Industrial Peace' fame, were put up to move the Vote of Thanks to George Hicks for his speech), when the invitation comes, as it will come, for the General Council to participate in an all-in national Industrial Peace Conference, there will be an acceptance of the offer in order that the existing leadership can put itself right with the electorate in preparation for the next election. . . . The workers need to be warned that this capitulation will not stave off new attacks on their conditions; on the contrary, under its cover plans will be laid to attack the workers on a larger scale than ever. As a matter of cold fact, the capitalists are showing their hand even while the workers' leaders, with tears in their eyes, are crying for Peace.

From *The Edinburgh Congress*, by Harry Pollitt.
October, 1927.

Book Reviews

MUSIC

How Music Expresses Ideas by S. Finkelstein (128 pp. Lawrence & Wishart, 9s. 6d.

FROM time to time there appear in the United States signs of the bravest defiance of its reactionary forces. Whitman was their precursor and has been their highest inspiration. The British General Strike produced from no British artist anything so fine as Hugo Gellert's illustration in *New Masses*. That paper's offspring, *Masses and Mainstream*, has for one of its editors Sidney Finkelstein, and this book of his is so important that no music-lover ought to miss it. It is so good that it will probably become a classic.

At first I was prejudiced against it because of the title. Music cannot express ideas; its function is to express the emotions associated with ideas. But the author soon puts that right. On the first page he writes: 'It has been from the very beginning an emotional activity of human beings, a way of giving those emotions outer form'. Later on he further elucidates his meaning: 'Ideas do not consist of things, such as persons or trees, or of emotions such as joy, yearning, sorrow. Ideas are relationships between things as reflected in the mind of a person who is touching, moving among, and living among these things. Social ideas are relationships among people, as seen by one who takes a part in and shares the historical movements and struggles in which the people are involved. The presence of emotion is a sign that the relationships are human and not mechanistic'.

Two thirds of the book are devoted to a clear exposition of

music's social importance as it was developed in Europe after the Dark Ages. Here and there he advances opinions with which some musicians will disagree. For example, I think he throws away the Communist Wagnerian baby with the disgusting bath in which the composer finally wallowed; and is unjust to Brahms because he was a shy man in an offensive world. But such disagreements are of the very essence of progress in matters regarding which we have not yet full understanding.

The last part of the book is of the greatest immediate importance. After the Russian music rumpus in 1948 there was a curious lull in the musical world through Europe and the United States. So many truly revolutionary musicians seemed to have laid themselves open to condemnation while, on the other hand, the academics seemed to have been justified; but that was a superficial view due to the fact that it is hard for anti-Soviet people to think in any but capitalist grooves. Finkelstein gives complete support to the attitude clarified by the Russian discussion, and crystallised by Zhdanov, their chairman. Finkelstein makes it clear that it is the cacophonists who are now the academics. The puzzlement is merely due to the fact that the modern pedants are standing on their heads. And he debunks their suggestion that they may be the men producing the music of the future though it is at present too deep for the average music-lover to enjoy; on the contrary, he offers example after example of the fact that the greatest masters of music have always reached the public in their own time.

RUTLAND BOUGHTON.

CHINA'S FEET UNBOUND

China's Feet Unbound, by W. G. Burchett. (190 pp. Lawrence & Wishart, 5s.).

This book is informative, convincing and dynamic. The author lived and worked in old and new China. In it you get the voice of the liberated peasants — 80 per cent of the population — who for the first time possess the land they till. The peasants tell their own stories of the effects of exploitation and cruelties inflicted by the landlords, Japanese and the Kuomintang officials and gendarmes. And how they now live happily, assisted and protected by the People's Government in which the workers are the leading force in alliance with the peasantry.

China's Feet Unbound gives the views of miners, railway and textile workers, dockers, cultural and professional workers. All tell the same story of imperialist oppression, beatings, robbery and murder by Chiang Kai-Shek's gangsters. They confirm the report (issued by the British Foreign Office in 1925) on child labour in the British-Administered Settlement of Shanghai where it is said: Children work in the textile mills 'who could not be more than six or seven years of age. Sometimes these children are not on the pay roll. . . Rows of baskets containing babies and children, sleeping or awake, as the case may be, lie placed between the rapidly moving and noisy machinery. Young children who are supposed to be working . . . lie asleep in every corner, some in the open, others hidden in baskets under a covering of raw cotton.' In match factories 'as little as nine copper cents is sometimes

paid to a child for a day's work. . . . Young children, certainly not more than five years of age were seen working with almost incredible rapidity.' The hours of labour in nearly all industries were from 12 to 16. Women worked at their machines a few hours prior to giving birth to their babies and returned a few days later, but with their babies — to breathe the lint-laden, humid atmosphere of the textile mills. And these conditions prevailed until, after twenty years of armed struggle, the Chinese were liberated by the People's Liberation Army.

Having lived and worked in China for nearly three years I too can confirm what the British Foreign Office published, and more. In 1927, a British post office official, discussing census results with me, said, 'Fifty per cent of the Chinese children die before reaching 5 years of age.' When I asked: 'Could nothing be done to save them?' his reply was 'What would happen if they didn't die?' And this was the general, contemptible attitude of most of Britain's imperialist agents. Now, as the author shows, usury, exorbitant taxation, bribery and robbery has been swept away. Foreign warships have disappeared from the rivers and harbours on the mainland of China, to mark the defeat of imperialist exploitation and aggression. Efficient democratic management of industry has arisen in both State owned and privately owned industry. In this book a statement of Butterfield and Swires' shipping manager testifies to the contrast between the old and the new:

In the old days when one of our ships pulled into Shanghai

or Tientsin we had to receive and entertain about 30 officials, each of whom had to be bribed, from the Chief port official to the gang-master — half the goods were stolen. Today, one official comes on board. There are no bribes or entertainment. We know just where we stand. There is no pilfering. *The Communists as far as we are concerned have wiped out graft, corruption and inefficiency.*

The author takes you on a 1,500 mile journey from Canton to Peking. You meet a P.L.A. girl, a Japanese technician and the ordinary Chinese travellers. The army girl puts questions to the Japanese. He replies with apologies for the terrible deeds committed by the Japanese occupation forces. He receives good wages. That is why he remains in China, etc. The author praised the train, its friendly spick-and-span service and punctuality. But the army girl said: 'Don't write anything about our trains until you have seen the women's train which runs to Tientsin from Peking!' The Women's train service teams have become a symbol that Chinese women have freed themselves from feudal bondage. The first full train crew of women, including driver, fireman and guard ran from Dairen to Port Arthur on International Women's Day, 1950.

It is these men and women who are holding back the imperialist aggressors in Korea, who are building the new China. They offer peace, friendship and trade to the British people, whose interest and need it is to accept the offer with both hands.

GEORGE HARDY.

INJURED INNOCENCE OR THE BITER BIT

Ordeal by Slander, by Owen Lattimore. (236 pp. MacGibbon & Kee. 13s. 6d.)

PROFESSOR LATTIMORE's defence might also be called 'You can't do this to the Liberals'. Slandered by Senator Joseph McCarthy, fronting for the China Lobby, as the 'top Russian espionage agent in the United States', Owen Lattimore found he had to defend himself against 'guilt by association, guilt by non-association, guilt by commission, guilt by omission, guilt by matrimony and, finally, guilt by paternity'.

Undoubtedly, as the book shows in its summary of the struggles before the House un-American Activities Committee he did this intelligently and courageously—as far as he went. Faced by perjurers, F.B.I. stool-pigeons, distorted quotations from his writings and by the whole weight of a biased machine, Lattimore did a good job *proving beyond any shadow of doubt that he had always been anti-Communist.*

It would be an insult to Professor Lattimore's undoubted intelligence to conclude that he is unaware that such a defence, while clearing himself, accepts the whole theory on which the un-American Activities Committee is based—that there is something reprehensible in being a Communist. Further, in his appeal for freedom of inquiry and opinion with which he ends his books, he says: 'This does not mean that Communists who actually organise for subversive purposes should not feel the weight of the law'. Not only that; he goes on to give the impression that he equates Communists with 'fascists and Ku Kluxers'. Whatever qualification Professor Latti-

more may mean when he writes of 'Communists who organise for subversive purposes', the fact remains that American Communists are being thrown in jail for holding an opinion and not for any subversive acts. On Senator Joseph McCarthy (the member for Formosa) Lattimore says:

He is usually described as a reckless political gambler and a wild-swinging bruiser . . . The truth is that every move he makes is coldly calculated, and that he is a master of a formidable technique. In his impassioned defence of the Nazi S.S. murderers who massacred unarmed American prisoners and Belgian civilians at Malmedy he drew on pro-Nazi sources of information, and in his use of China Lobby material against me he was again in touch with pro-Nazi propagandists. It is not surprising therefore that so much of the fascist pattern appears in his technique of vilification.

All too true. But Owen Lattimore has still to learn that fascism can't be defeated without the Communists.

T. McW.

REAL HISTORY

British Trade Unionism, by Allen Hutt. (200 pp. Lawrence & Wishart. Cloth, 12s. 6d.; paper, 7s. 6d.)

THE re-issue of this 'short history' with its new and up-to-date section is a real service to the labour movement. Starting with the Combination Acts of 1799-1800, it's the *real* history of what Marx called 'the first-born sons of modern industry', related in language as robust as their struggle itself. In those days men were men and pansies were bunches of flowers. Builders were locked out in London because they refused Knobby beer! The cotton

spinners of Oldham demanded an eight-hour day, and women played a prominent part in this struggle which involved, like many others, fierce fights with the police. All this in 1834! Of course, there were no O.B.E.'s or M.B.E.'s for the knighthood of the underlings then. The working-class were not 'respectable'; they did not have the statesmanlike leaders we possess today. If readers want to know more about this they must read the book—as they must if they wish to know about the greatest heroic struggle of miners ever seen in this country which was 'suppressed with revolting cruelty'; about the mid-Victorian period of the 'fair day's wage for a fair day's work' (a peculiar sort of fairness if as Engels says, 'the workman gives as much, the capitalist gives as little, as the nature of the bargain will admit!'); or the 'Great Offensive' of the years before the First World War, of which a Conservative historian wrote: 'If the war peril from Germany delayed much longer to materialise, it seemed quite on the cards that it might be forestalled by revolution'.

Hutt brings home to all trade unionists the role of the 'upper crust' of the trade union officialdom which has always sought to save Britain for the capitalist class. They did it during the 1914-18 war, they betrayed the workers in the Triple Alliance, they defeated them in the General Strike, they urged class collaboration (Mondism and Nationalisation); at the Norwich T.U.C. in 1937, Mr. Ernest Bevin declared that the T.U.C. has 'now virtually become an integral part of the State'.

The treacherous Nazi assault on the Soviet Union brought from

Churchill his historic utterance pledging support to the U.S.S.R.; and this marked a historic and complete turning point for the trade union movement. By 1944 T.U.C. affiliations were nearly 7,000,000, and most imposing event of all, the holding of the World Trade Union Conference, London, in February, 1945, with its stirring determination to exterminate fascism and 'to combat war and the causes of war'.

Hutt ends this working class history, with its clear understanding of the development of our class and its enemies:

The Tories—their class bloated with an unparalleled and soaring surfeit of profits . . . speak of grave and great cuts to come. It is evident that the workers' standards cannot be defended without fighting for a reduction of the

crushing burden of rearmament, that is to say without fighting for peace; and the fight for peace is bound to mean linking with the peace-seeking forces in the world—the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies, People's China—and a break with aggressive America.

This history will compel the reader to regard the old rank and file of the T.U. movement with affection and admiration; it should cause some hatred to be engendered when the role of the right wing and the 'upper crust' is understood and the position of our class enemies—the ruling class—is charted. The one question from it all is, how long will the working class tolerate capitalism?

JAMES DAVIDSON.

Shorter Notices

The Struggle For A Free Press, by E. P. Thompson. (24 pp. Peoples' Press, 6d.)

FROM the first days of the press, the ruling class has striven to keep knowledge from the working class, and the fearless defiance and shining integrity of those who have challenged their right to do this makes an inspiring story. Absorbing, too, are the stories of journals like the famous *Northern Star* of Chartist times; Ernest Jones' *The People's Paper*; *The Commonweal*, started by William Morris. Capitalist monopoly now strangles Britain's press and banishes professional standards, with one proud excep-

tion—*The Daily Worker*; and the pamphlet's concluding section describes its indispensable role in the people's fight today for truth and freedom.

B.M.B.

Public Order. Arthur G. Keech. (48 pp. Jordon & Sons, Ltd. 2s. 6d.) HAVING already produced a companion piece entitled *Suspects And Loiterers*, the inspector in charge of training the Kent County Constabulary has now written a summary of the law on public order. It might be sub-titled *The Cop's Guide To Promotion*.

A.T.

such depravity.' Another Canadian bears out this denunciation of 'propaganda by press and radio, and they are all the same. The B.B.C. — except that it out-drivels them all — is the same as the N.B.C., C.B.S., A.B.C., or our own C.B.C. We only get one side, what originates in Washington or Wall Street.' Across the border, a life-long fighter for peace, born in the decade of the American Civil War, sums it up as 'a political whirlpool, in which our country is now being reduced to a veritable "mush of concession," but we are not all corrupted.' No, indeed; nor do they lack grounds for confidence. 'If you think the situation looks bleak,' writes another Canadian, 'just look back 35 years, to 1917. Then look back 15 years, to 1933 and Hitler. How can we lose?' Let a worker in Britain, now in his 'seventies, complete the picture: 'I fear the bloodbath the Yanksters would force on the world. But the working class must win. The Yankee rulers are so near the character of the Nazis that the world's workers will refuse to carry arms for them in the end, and they will collapse. I hope it will come before I go from here.'

I like to think that he may have worked alongside one of our Canadian friends, when over here on war work. Close on seventy, and victimised for his political opinions, he does 'casual labour and picks up a dollar or two here and there, and I get by. I am transferring my post-war credit, earned in Britain during the war, to you for the fund. What I never had, I never miss, but I am pleased to send it. In Canadian money it is pretty small; but there is no Truman Doctrine about it, no Marshall Plan, no Point IV, no strings at all.' Ah, but there are strings — strings strong enough to strangle war itself. The bonds of fellowship and international solidarity are just about the strongest links in the world. And if it were not for 'pretty small' sums like his, the August fund would not look so healthy at

£46 7s. 5d.

STAND-IN MONEY came from: 'Bath', standing-in for Aylesbury, Cardiff, Totnes, Warwick and Watford, 10s.; 'Billie', standing-in for Tonypandy 'in memory of Lewis Jones', 1s.; 'Exeter', standing-in for Birmingham, Coventry, Crediton, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Norwich, Southampton, Turton (Lancs.) and Weymouth (pre-paid); F.C. (U.S.A.), standing-in for Willington (pre-paid).

STEADY MONEY came from: 'Bath', 10s.; Anon. 'Whiteburch', 1s.; 'Leicester', 10s.; J.H., 'Ipswich', 5s.; P.O'H., 'Dublin', 2s.; 'Exeter', (pre-paid); J.F., 'Aberdeen', (pre-paid); A.G., 'Arbroath', (pre-paid); 'Chicago', £1 8s. 4d.; 'New York', (pre-paid); J. & K.F., 'East Edinburgh' (pre-paid); D. H. Strathern and friends (pre-paid); Red Sergeant, 2s. 6d.; Socialist Sailor, £1; D.G. & P.W., £5; D. Rees, £1; H.G.B., 2s.; E. D. McCallum, 10s.; 'Humanite', 3s.; T. Flood 2s. 6d.; D. M. Clarke, 10s.; W. S. Farnell, 5s.; R.F.B., £3; 'Tam O'Shanter and Grey Mare', 5s.; The Humphreys Family, 4s.; H. Tinkler, 5s.; J. Renouf, 5s.; O. Greene, 12; R. McLeod, 10s.; D.M., 6s.; J. A. Purton, 7s. 6d.; P. N. Brinson, 10s.; E.J.B., 4s.

Other contributions include: K.V.S. (Canada), 14s. 10d.; M. G. Balkin, 2s.; G.B. (New Zealand), £2; J. W. Rully, 1s.; F. Anderson, 2s.; A. W. Kingsley, 2s.; Anon. I, £4 2s. 0d.; D. P. Wicks, 5s.; Anon. II (Cheshire), 10s.; M. Knill, 1s.; S. Hettleman, 2s.; A. A. Wills, 7s.; S. F. Oakey, 1s.; E. McLeod, 5s.; 'York', 3s.; C. F. Burn, £1; C. M. Ford, £1 2s. 0d.; P. Davies, 1s. 6d.; Anon. III, 1s.; F. D. Tyson, 2s.; D.D., 10s.; 'Salute to the Dean', £1 1s. 0d.; A. J. Salmon, 1s.; E. Blavell, 2s.; T. Gaskell, £1; G. Mearns, 2s.; A. G. Perkins, 12s.; J. Rubenstein, 2s.; R. Heslop, 5s.; S. D. Humphries, 2s.; J. H. Wilson, 1s.; J. Duffy, 12s.; A. Hampton, 3s.; J. Purves, 6s.; H.I.D. (U.S.A.), 14s.; W.G.B. (U.S.A.), 11s.; B.H. (U.S.A.), 12 9s. 6d.; 'Post-war Credit' (Canada), £5 14s. 9d.

Our thanks to you all.

ANGELA TUCKETT

Co-op No. L99482

134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3

Labour Monthly PAMPHLETS

TRUTH ABOUT THE U.S.S.R.

by
D. N. PRITT, Q.C.
(6d.)

CONCERNING PRACTICE

by
MAO TSETUNG
(6d.)

**UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF
WILLIAM MORRIS**

by
R. PAGE ARNOT
(1s.)

Order from bookshops, or Dept. J,
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3

'CHINA TO-DAY'

By **SUNDAR LAL**

(Historian, Pioneer of Indian
National Movement, who led the
Indian People's Goodwill Mission
to China, 1951)

*The most authentic, unbiased
Indian view of New China*

Over 750 pages.
31 illustrations. Maps.

15/-

From **CURRENT BOOK DEPOT**
THE MALL, KANPUR (India)

NATIONAL GUARDIAN

The Progressive Newsweekly

**Authoritative voice of the
American progressive
movement**

Edited by CEDRIC BELFRAGE

Annual Subscription 24s.

ORDER FROM COLLET'S
40, GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.1.

LABOUR RESEARCH

October issue includes :

'Engineering Profits'

'Malayan Tin'

'Division of the National "Cake"'

Monthly 9d. ; p.a., 10s. 6d.

**LABOUR RESEARCH
DEPARTMENT**

2, Soho Square, London, W.1.

FOR SPECIMEN COPIES

Please send a free specimen copy to:—

(1) Name

Address

(2) Name

Address

You may mention my name,

Signed.....

or/I enclose note to be sent on.

Address

TO THE MANAGER, 134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3